



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/701,242	02/01/2001	Fumio Nagasaka	107926	7319
25944	7590	02/19/2004	EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320			PATEL, HARESH N	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2154		
DATE MAILED: 02/19/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/701,242 Examiner Haresh Patel	NAGASAKA ET AL. Art Unit 2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-14 are presented for examination.

Priority

2. Applicant needs to submit a certified copy of the foreign priority document.

Specification

3. The following guidelines illustrate the preferred layout for the specification of a utility application. These guidelines are suggested for the applicant's use.

Arrangement of the Specification

As provided in 37 CFR 1.77(b), the specification of a utility application should include the following sections in order. Each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without underlining or bold type, as a section heading. If no text follows the section heading, the phrase "Not Applicable" should follow the section heading:

- (a) TITLE OF THE INVENTION.
- (b) CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS.
- (c) STATEMENT REGARDING FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH OR DEVELOPMENT.
- (d) INCORPORATION-BY-REFERENCE OF MATERIAL SUBMITTED ON A COMPACT DISC (See 37 CFR 1.52(e)(5) and MPEP 608.05. Computer program listings (37 CFR 1.96(c)), "Sequence Listings" (37 CFR 1.821(c)), and tables having more than 50 pages of text are permitted to be submitted on compact discs.) or REFERENCE TO A "MICROFICHE APPENDIX" (See MPEP § 608.05(a). "Microfiche Appendices" were accepted by the Office until March 1, 2001.)
- (e) BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.
 - (1) Field of the Invention.
 - (2) Description of Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.
- (f) BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.
- (g) BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL VIEWS OF THE DRAWING(S).
- (h) DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION.

Art Unit: 2154

- (i) CLAIM OR CLAIMS (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (j) ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (k) SEQUENCE LISTING (See MPEP § 2424 and 37 CFR 1.821-1.825. A "Sequence Listing" is required on paper if the application discloses a nucleotide or amino acid sequence as defined in 37 CFR 1.821(a) and if the required "Sequence Listing" is not submitted as an electronic document on compact disc).

The disclosure is objected. Some of the informalities are:

- i. BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION section is missing.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1, 6 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by IDEHARA, Input-Output Apparatus selecting method for network system, 12/20/2001, US 2001/0552995 (Hereinafter Idehara).

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

7. As per claims 1, 6 and 9, teaches the following:

a method of retrieving a device mapped to a desired person among a plurality of devices present on a network and displaying a result of retrieval on a screen of a display unit,

a device retrieving apparatus that retrieves a device mapped to a desired person among a plurality of devices present on a network,

a computer readable recording medium in which a specific computer program is recorded, said specific computer program being used to retrieve a device mapped to a desired person among a plurality of devices present on a network and display a result of retrieval on a screen of a display unit connecting with a computer,

said device retrieving apparatus comprising,

a display unit having a screen, an input unit that is used to externally input an instruction and a control unit (e.g., In a network system to which a plurality of computers and a plurality of input-output apparatuses are connected, a layout diagram showing locations of the input-output apparatuses is displayed on a display means and icons each representing one of the input-output apparatuses are displayed over the layout diagram at locations corresponding to the locations at which the apparatuses are actually installed, abstract),

(a) specifying an individual description of the desired person (e.g., changing name of an individual, paragraphs 135 – 175),

(b) obtaining a device description mapped to the specified individual description out of mapping information which is provided in advance (e.g., retrieving existing information on the devices for an individual from the information table, paragraphs 135 – 175), and regards mapping of a plurality of individual descriptions (e.g., different user preferences information, paragraphs 135 – 175) to device descriptions expressing said plurality of devices present on the

Art Unit: 2154

network (e.g., retrieving existing information on the devices for an individual from the information table, paragraphs 135 – 175), and

(c) causing at least one of the obtained device description and a device symbol representing a device expressed by the obtained device description to be displayed on the screen of said display unit (e.g., display icons of the devices for each individuals, paragraphs 135 – 175, figures 52, 53).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Idehara in view of Hogan et al. 5,414,809 (Hereinafter Hogan).

10. As per claim 5, Idehara teaches the following:

device positions -related information with regard to mapping of positions related to devices to the device descriptions (e.g., different devices, fax machines, printers, etc., network devices location in the building, i.e., floor location, figure 25, paragraphs 130 -154), and said control unit (computer CPU) specifies a position mapped to the specific individual description (e.g., assigning of a fax machine, a printer or a network device from a desired floor location for an individual, paragraphs 130 -154), reads a device description mapped to the specified position out of the device positions-related information (e.g., accessing of the database

for a fax machine, printer or a network device from a desired floor location for an individual, paragraphs 130 -154), and obtains the read-out device description as the device description mapped to the specific individual description (e.g., display of an assigned network device, i.e., fax machine, a printer floor location for an individual, paragraphs 130 –154).

However, Idehara does not specifically mention about the floor location of an individual.

Hogan teaches the following:

individual positions-related information with regard to mapping of positions related to individuals to the individual descriptions (e.g., displaying, entering, mapping and storing of an individual floor location for an individual, figure 5, col., 46, line 60 – col., 55, line 10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Idehara with the teachings of Hogan in order to facilitate location of the information available for each individual to link other information related to an individual. The motivation would be obvious because the information entered about an individual including the location of an individual's office would help link with an individual's other information and the referenced information can be displayed on the computer monitor when necessary, as suggested by Hogan.

11. Claims 2, 7 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamner et al. 5,796,951 (Hereinafter Hamner) in view of Minasi ("Mastering Windows NT Server 4", fifth edition, 1998, pages 343 – 351).

12. As per claims 2, 7 and 10, Hamner discloses the invention substantially as claimed including:

Art Unit: 2154

a method of retrieving a device mapped to a desired person among a plurality of devices present on a network and displaying a result of retrieval on a screen of a display unit, said method comprising the steps of,

a device retrieving apparatus that retrieves a device mapped to a desired person among a plurality of devices present on a network,

a computer readable recording medium in which a specific computer program is recorded, said specific computer program being used to retrieve a device mapped to a desired person among a plurality of devices present on a network and display a result of retrieval on a screen of a display unit connecting with a computer,

(a) causing individual symbols corresponding to individuals to be displayed on the screen of said display unit (e.g., a device window 201 and a task window 202 of figure 2A, figure 2B, col., 4, lines 17 – 32),

(b) selecting a specific individual symbol corresponding to the desired person among the individual symbols displayed (e.g., Double-clicking on a group bitmap with a cursor control device will cause that group to be expanded in the device window, col., 4, lines 10-12),

(c) obtaining a device description mapped to an individual description of the desired person corresponding to the selected specific individual symbol out of mapping information, which is provided in advance and regards mapping of a plurality of individual descriptions to device descriptions expressing said plurality of devices present on the network; (e.g., col., 4, lines 10-12, Data is gathered about a present configuration of the network, including the types of devices in the network, the quantity of each type of device present in the network, the relationships between the devices, and the tasks performable upon each of the devices. The data

is then stored in a database representing a network map. A display is generated corresponding to the network map using the data in the database, abstract), and

(d) causing at least one of the obtained device description and a device symbol representing a device expressed by the obtained device description to be displayed on the screen of said display unit (e.g., col., 4, lines 10-12).

Hamner does not specifically use individual symbols corresponding to persons and individual information corresponding to the selected persons. However, the concept of associating any individual symbol and individual information to a corresponding mapped characteristic is clearly disclosed by Hamner and it is also well known in the prior art, for example, Minasi, discloses the use of person symbols and the person information (e.g., to view and manage the properties of a displayed user account or group, simply double click on the name of the account or group, page 349).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hamner and Minasi because Minasi's use of individual person symbol and person information would facilitate identifying individual person symbol and correspondingly manage the information each individual person. The users would be able to easily identify their respective symbols and would help them manage their own personal settings of the devices, as suggested by Minasi.

13. Claims 3, 4, 8 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamner in view of Minasi and further in view of Person, "Using Windows 95", Special edition, 1995, pages 105-107).

14. As per claims 3, 8 and 11, the claims are rejected for the same reasons as claims 2, 7 and 10 above. Hamner and Minasi do not explicitly disclose mapping a desired device symbol to a specific individual symbol. Person, on the other hand, discloses mapping (drag and drop) from one symbol to another symbol (e.g., drag and drop method can be used to drag one object and drop on another, page 105 – page 107).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hamner, Minasi and Person because Person's use of dragging a symbol and dropping it on another symbol would facilitate an easy and faster mapping of a user symbol the device symbol. Dragging a device symbol on the user's symbol or the window containing the user's personal settings would be an easier way of mapping a device to the desired user, as suggested by Person.

15. As per claim 4, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 3 above. Hamner also discloses including:

in the case where a device represented by the first device symbol keeps data, causes data symbols representing respective data kept in the device to be displayed in a specific area on the screen of said display unit (e.g., a device window 201 of figure 2A, figure 2B, col., 4, lines 17 – 32), which is different from an area in which at least one of the obtained device description and the corresponding second device symbol is displayed (e.g., a task window 202 of figure 2A, figure 2B, col., 4, lines 17 – 32).

Art Unit: 2154

16. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamner and Minasi in view of Idehara and Hogan.

17. As per claim 12, Hamner and Minasi do not specifically mention about the positions related to devices and individuals.

Idehara teaches the following:

device positions -related information with regard to mapping of positions related to devices to the device descriptions (e.g., different devices, fax machines, printers, etc., network devices location in the building, i.e., floor location, figure 25, paragraphs 130 -154), and said control unit (computer CPU) specifies a position mapped to the specific individual description (e.g., assigning of a fax machine, a printer or a network device from a desired floor location for an individual, paragraphs 130 -154), reads a device description mapped to the specified position out of the device positions-related information (e.g., accessing of the database for a fax machine, printer or a network device from a desired floor location for an individual, paragraphs 130 -154), and obtains the read-out device description as the device description mapped to the specific individual description (e.g., display of an assigned network device, i.e., fax machine, a printer floor location for an individual, paragraphs 130 –154).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hamner and Minasi with the teachings of Idehara in order to facilitate location of the information available for each device for an individual to select and have it linked in his device selection, as suggested by Idehara.

Hamner, Minasi and Idehara do not specifically mention about the floor location of an individual.

Hogan teaches the following:

individual positions-related information with regard to mapping of positions related to individuals to the individual descriptions (e.g., displaying, entering, mapping and storing of an individual floor location for an individual, figure 5, col., 46, line 60 – col., 55, line 10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hamner, Minasi and Idehara with the teachings of Hogan in order to facilitate location of the information available for each individual to link other information related to an individual. The motivation would be obvious because the information entered about an individual including the location of an individual's office would help link with an individual's other information and the referenced information can be displayed on the computer monitor when necessary, as suggested by Hogan.

18. Claims 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamner, Minasi and Person in view of Idehara and Hogan.

19. As per claims 13 and 14, Hamner, Person and Minasi do not specifically mention about the positions related to devices and individuals.

Idehara teaches the following:

device positions -related information with regard to mapping of positions related to devices to the device descriptions (e.g., different devices, fax machines, printers, etc., network devices location in the building, i.e., floor location, figure 25, paragraphs 130 -154), and said control unit (computer CPU) specifies a position mapped to the specific individual description (e.g., assigning of a fax machine, a printer or a network device from a desired floor

Art Unit: 2154

location for an individual, paragraphs 130 -154), reads a device description mapped to the specified position out of the device positions-related information (e.g., accessing of the database for a fax machine, printer or a network device from a desired floor location for an individual, paragraphs 130 -154), and obtains the read-out device description as the device description mapped to the specific individual description (e.g., display of an assigned network device, i.e., fax machine, a printer floor location for an individual, paragraphs 130 –154).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hamner, Person and Minasi with the teachings of Idehara in order to facilitate location of the information available for each device for an individual to select and have it linked in his device selection, as suggested by Idehara.

Hamner, Person, Minasi and Idehara do not specifically mention about the floor location of an individual.

Hogan teaches the following:

individual positions-related information with regard to mapping of positions related to individuals to the individual descriptions (e.g., displaying, entering, mapping and storing of an individual floor location for an individual, figure 5, col., 46, line 60 – col., 55, line 10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hamner, Person, Minasi and Idehara with the teachings of Hogan in order to facilitate location of the information available for each individual to link other information related to an individual. The motivation would be obvious because the information entered about an individual including the location of an individual's office would help link with

an individual's other information and the referenced information can be displayed on the computer monitor when necessary, as suggested by Hogan.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Haresh Patel whose telephone number is (703) 605-5234. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday from 10:00 am to 8:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee, can be reached at (703) 305-8498.

The appropriate fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Haresh Patel

February 11, 2004.



JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100